



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/074,763

02/11/2002

Ramachandra Bethmangalkar

SUN-P7089

1089

45657

7590

12/29/2005

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP  
AND SUN MICROSYSTEMS, INC.  
2055 GATEWAY PLACE  
SUITE 550  
SAN JOSE, CA 95110-1089

EXAMINER

PATEL, CHIRAG R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2141

DATE MAILED: 12/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/074,763	BETHMANGALKAR ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Chirag R. Patel	2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 November 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 48-62 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-47 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 48-62 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 48-59 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. A discussion is provided below.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 48, 52, and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holmberg (US 6,247,141) in view of Breitbart et al. – hereinafter Breitbart (US 5,999,931).

As per claim 48, Holmberg discloses a method implemented by a secondary server to maintain a secondary directory, comprising:

receiving notification from a primary server that a particular non-idempotent operation has been performed by the primary server on a primary directory; (Col 5 lines 65-67, Col 6 lines 1-18)

in response to the notification, performing the particular non-idempotent operation on the secondary directory such that the secondary directory mirrors the primary directory; (Col 5 lines 65-67, Col 6 lines 1-18)

receiving a request, from a client, to perform the particular non-idempotent operation on the secondary directory, wherein the client sends the request because the client has not received confirmation that the primary server has performed the particular non-idempotent operation on the primary directory. (Col 7 lines 21-34)

Holmberg fails to disclose determining particular update to secondary directory cannot be made, and sending an indication to the client that the particular non-idempotent operation was successfully performed even though operation actually not performed on the secondary directory.

Breitbart discloses recognizing that the particular non-idempotent operation identified in the request cannot be performed on the secondary directory because the particular non-idempotent operation has already been performed on the secondary directory as a result of receiving the notification from the primary server; and (Col 3 lines 47-53)

and in response to the recognition that the particular non-idempotent operation has already been performed on the secondary directory, the secondary server sending an indication to the client that the particular non-idempotent operation was successfully performed on the secondary directory even though the non-idempotent operation was not performed on the secondary directory after receiving the request. (Col 3 lines 47-53) At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to disclose determining particular update to secondary directory cannot be made, and sending an indication to the client that the particular non-

idempotent operation was successfully performed even though operation actually not performed on the secondary directory in the disclosure of Holmberg. The motivation for doing do would have been to write-write conflicts on secondary copies of data items, and thereby achieves substantially reduced communication. (Col 3 lines 38-59)

Claims 49-51, 53-55, and 57-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holmberg (US 6,247,141) / Breitbart (US 5,999,931) in view of Hsiao et al. – hereinafter Hsiao (US 2002/0174103)

As per claims 49, Holmberg/Breitbart disclose the method of claim 48. Holmberg fails to disclose wherein particular non-idempotent operation is an add, delete, or rename operation. Hsiao discloses wherein wherein particular non-idempotent operation is an add, delete, or rename operation. ([0007],[0013], [0065]) At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to disclose wherein particular non-idempotent operation is an add, delete, or rename operation in the disclosure of Holmberg. The motivation for doing do would have been to ensure consistency the changes one partner makes to a file should be replicated into the other partner's file system and DBMS. ([0007])

Claims 60-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holmberg (US 6,247,141) / Breitbart (US 5,999,931) in view of Shih et al. – hereinafter Shih (US 6,615,223).

As per claims 60-62, Holmberg disclose the method of claim 48. Holmberg fails to disclose wherein said primary directory and said secondary directory are both LDAP directories. (Col 3 lines 10-22) At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to disclose wherein said primary directory and said secondary directory are both LDAP directories in the disclosure of Holmberg. The motivation for doing so would have been to reflect political, geographic, or organizational boundaries. (Col 3 lines 10-22)

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. These references are disclosed in the Notices of References cited page and teach numerous methods for high availability lightweight directory access protocol service. A close review of these references is recommended.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chirag R. Patel whose telephone number is (571)272-7966. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7:30AM to 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia, can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2141

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pairedirect.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll free).



RUPAL DHARIA  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER